

Attachment C: SEPA Checklist Supplemental Sheet (Part D) Questions and Responses

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise:

Under all three planning scenarios identified in Attachment A new development or redevelopment would be required to comply with current regulations related to water, air, toxic or hazardous substances, and noise.

The proposed stormwater strategy would result in infiltration of all stormwater with water quality treatment consistent with state guidelines. Compared to today the long-term expectation is that industrial noise and activity would diminish while noise associated with mixed-use multifamily development would increase.

Current local, state, and federal laws and regulations are likely to be sufficient to mitigate significant adverse impacts related to water, air, the release of toxic or hazardous substances, and production of noise.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

- Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations.
- Implementing proposed stormwater strategy, which prioritizes infiltration and bioretention.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Neither Scenario 2 (preferred action) nor Scenario 3 are expected to significantly affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. There are no plans for significant growth in wildlife areas. Fish and marine life are impacted mainly by the quality of the stormwater infrastructure. Such infrastructure is expected to improve over time as properties redevelop and implement modern stormwater controls such as infiltration and bioretention, which are generally more ecologically protective than historic controls.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are:

Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations, including stormwater regulations.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Planning Scenario 2 and 3 allow redevelopment of existing properties at higher development intensities, which will require energy and natural resources. Total energy needs would be lower compared to the same amount of development in a sprawling setting, and would be similar to

needs in other urban areas. All development would be within walking or bicycling distance of light rail transit, potentially reducing energy needs from transportation.

Compared to Scenario 1 (no action), there is likely an increase in the amount of natural resources and energy required to support the planned level of growth mainly due to increased development capacity. On the other hand, building and energy codes typically demand continuous improvement in energy efficiency, which may offset some of the potential increase in demand. Further, the proposal exists entirely within an already-developed urban area, resulting in no “greenfield” development. Policy would be adopted establishing a local center designation further strengthening the priorities of maximizing existing developed areas and infrastructure.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

- Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations, including building and energy codes.
- Continued support for the extension of light rail transit to Southeast Redmond.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands:

Scenario 2 (preferred action) and Scenario 3 are unlikely to affect environmentally sensitive areas, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, wetlands, floodplains or prime farmlands. However, either scenario could result in increased use of Marymoor Park due to increased residential and employee population nearby. Areas for two neighborhood parks and a plaza have been identified as priorities and could be provided as development incentives in Scenario 2 and Scenario 3. Both Scenarios will also provide enhanced connections to Marymoor Park. The enhanced connections to Marymoor Park and the development of additional neighborhood parks and plaza should adequately serve the recreational needs of residents within the subarea.

The area identified as the Marymoor subarea and local center is located in very close proximity to known archaeological resources and the anticipated risk of the presence of archaeological resources, as determined by WISAARD, is very high in the western portion, high in the central and majority of the eastern portion of the subarea, and moderate in a small area of the most eastern portion. Eighteen properties within the subarea are identified by WISAARD as meeting the age minimum for historic classification.

Of these, six properties have been assessed and determined to be ineligible for designation as follows:

Property ID (WISAARD)	Date of Determination	WA SHPO Comments
#54035 Seattle, Lake Shore and Eastern Railroad	2/11/2014	090806-11-FTA determined
#54179	6/3/2009	
#54180	2/11/2014	
#54182	2/11/2014	
#54206	2/11/2014	
#54181	2/11/2014	

Seven properties meeting the age minimum for historic classification are designated as not being eligible for nomination though do not include notes by the WA SHPO clarifying their possible eligibility:

- #497090,
- #46739
- #46771, and
- #46784, #46785, #46786 and #46787 – identified as Campbell Mill Company Worker’s Houses.

Structures at three of the aforementioned properties are proposed for demolition as part of new, private development: #46739, #46771, and #54181.

WISAARD also depicts three historic properties in proximity to and including #41769 – Campbell Mill Foreman’s House as having no determination. These sites, within the East Lake Sammamish Parkway right-of-way, appear to be inaccurate and either refer to structures at other locations such as the Marymoor Farm Dutch Windmill located in Marymoor Park or include no information associated with the location.

Two additional properties obtained from the King County Assessor’s records are within the area of focus: # 333309 and 284372. A determination has not been established for these properties.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

- Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations.
- Any redevelopment in each of the three planning scenarios would require the completion of a cultural resources survey, completed by a qualified professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards, CFR Title 36 Part 61, in advance of any ground disturbance to identify early on any features or sites which may need protection and/or mitigation. Consultation with affected Tribes will also be required. Projects will be conditioned to complete consultation and surveys as well as to fulfill the report’s recommendations based on approval by the WA Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Planning Scenario 2 (preferred action) and Scenario 3 would change land use and zoning designations for the Marymoor Subarea. Much of the subarea would allow mixed-use/multifamily development, with highest intensities near the planned light rail station and lower intensities adjacent to Marymoor Park. The eastern part of the subarea would continue to have a commercial/manufacturing focus, but with increased development capacity. These changes are consistent with Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan policies.

There would be no change to allowed shoreline uses under the plan and the land use pattern is consistent with the City's shoreline designation environments.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demand for transportation or public services and utilities?

Planning Scenario 2 (preferred action) and Scenario 3 are expected to result in increased demand for transportation and public services and utilities compared to Scenario 1 (no action).

Under Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, additional multifamily and commercial growth would be permitted in the Marymoor Subarea. This growth will require transportation facilities for access and circulation, public and private utilities, and basic services. To accommodate future growth the proposal includes an integrated infrastructure plan for transportation and utilities.

Traffic analysis of the proposed infrastructure plan indicates that:

- The proposed street network would allow key intersections to operate at an acceptable level of service
- The NE 70th St and SR 202 intersection may need future reconfiguration including an added through lane on NE 70th St and lengthened left turning lanes on SR 202
- A right-in, right-out access to the Marymoor Subarea on SR 202 northwest of NE 70th St is essential to support ingress traffic to the subarea
- NE 63rd St at E Lake Sammamish Pkwy could be a stop-controlled intersection in the near term but may require a signal in the future depending on impacts from development and traffic growth
- SR 202 congestion has a major influence on ingress and egress traffic in the Marymoor Subarea. Further study is needed to determine the future long-term improvements at the E Lk Samm Pkwy-SR 202 intersection and the SR 202 corridor as a whole

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

- Compliance with existing federal, state and local environmental regulations.
- Implementation of infrastructure plan to accommodate growth.
- Future study of the SR 202 corridor in Southeast Redmond to mitigate existing traffic operational issues and manage overall congestion.

- Coordination with private utilities and other service providers (schools, transit agencies, etc.) during the plan update process and during plan implementation.
- 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.**

The proposal is not believed to conflict with any such laws or requirements.